

REMARKS

Claims 16-29 are pending and under consideration. Claims 16-28 have been amended. Claim 29 has been added. Support for the amendments to claims 16-28, as well as for new claim 29, may be found in the claims as originally filed. Further reconsideration is requested based on the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Response to Arguments:

The Applicants appreciate the consideration given to their arguments. The Applicants, however, are disappointed that their arguments were not found to be persuasive. Further reconsideration is thus requested.

Objections to the Claims:

Claims 16-28 were objected to for various informalities. Claims 16-28 were amended in substantial accord with the Examiner's suggestions. The Examiner's suggestions are appreciated. Withdrawal of the objection is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,847,968 to Miura et al. (hereinafter "Miura"). The rejection is traversed to the extent it would apply to the claims as amended.

The fourth clause of claim 18 recites:

Said user selects and designates said processing-related information displayed on said window.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "said user selects and designates said processing-related information displayed on said window," as recited in claim 18. Miura mentions no designation of processing-related information by a designer at all, contrary to the assertion in the final Office Action in the fourth bullet in section 5 at page 3. In Miura, rather, selecting and determining, or designating, is taken care of by the printed circuit board CAD device itself, as described at column 3, lines 50-53:

(1) A printed circuit board CAD device for determining a placement position of each component and routing paths of connectors between them in a component group in a schematic circuit diagram.

Since, in Miura, the placement position of each component is determined by the printed circuit board CAD device, there is no use for, let alone any disclosure of, "said user selects and

designates said processing-related information displayed on said window," as recited in claim 18.

Rather, in Miura, components placement positions have *already* been determined by the printed circuit board CAD device, as described at column 3, lines 56-63:

Avoiding components whose placement positions are already determined, a next component waiting to be read out from the placement order storage unit; an occupied area storage unit in which occupied area information describing, when a new component is read out by the read-out unit, an area occupied by a component whose placement position is already determined and connectors whose routing paths are already determined on a circuit board is stored.

Since, in Miura, the components placement positions have already been determined by the printed circuit board CAD device, there is no use for, let alone any disclosure of, "said user selects and designates said processing-related information displayed on said window," as recited in claim 18.

Furthermore, in Miura, a routing path determination unit determines routing paths of connectors between components whose placement positions have *already* been determined, as described at column 4, lines 56-63:

A routing path determination unit for determining, when the placement position of the component is determined, routing paths of connectors between terminals of the component and terminals of a component whose placement position is already determined, avoiding the occupied area on the circuit board by referring to the occupied area information already stored in the occupied area storage unit.

Since, in Miura, the routing path determination unit determines routing paths of connectors between components whose placement positions have already been determined, there is no use for, let alone any disclosure of, "said user selects and designates said processing-related information displayed on said window," as recited in claim 18.

The user's involvement in Miura, rather, is limited to moving a mouse cursor and typing on a keyboard, as described at column 14, lines 19-23:

Input operation unit 4 comprises: a pointing device for moving a mouse cursor on high resolution display 2 according to operation of a user; and a key board for providing input environment of interaction edit on receiving input from a user.

Since, in Miura, the user is not involved in component placement or routing path determination, there is no use for, let alone any disclosure of, "said user selects and designates said processing-related information displayed on said window," as recited in claim 18.

In Miura, rather, the circuit design application program is executed using information inputted by a designer, as described at column 12, lines 27-33:

Storage device 1 stores a circuit design application program for implementing schematic circuit diagram design, various design information inputted by a designer during the circuit design application program is executed, and a packaging design application program for implementing packaging design.

Since, in Miura, the circuit design application program is executed using information inputted by a designer, there is no use for, let alone any disclosure of, "said user selects and designates said processing-related information displayed on said window," as recited in claim 18.

The fourth clause of claim 18 recites further:

Said displayed placement and wiring graphic information associated with relevant processing-related information is specified.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "said displayed placement and wiring graphic information associated with relevant processing-related information is specified," as recited in claim 18. In Miura, rather, the user is not involved in component placement or routing path determination, as discussed above. Claim 18 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 20:

Claim 20 recites:

Selecting an area containing said displayed placement and wiring graphic information on said editor screen.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "selecting an area containing said displayed placement and wiring graphic information on said editor screen," as recited in claim 20. In Miura, rather, the user is not involved in component placement or routing path determination, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 18. Claim 20 is thus submitted to be allowable as well, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 18. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 20 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 22:

Claim 22 recites:

Highlighting said displayed connecting relationship information between pieces of placement and wiring graphic information selected by a user and non-selected pieces of placement and wiring graphic information not selected by the user, on said editor screen.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "highlighting said displayed connecting relationship information between pieces of placement and wiring graphic information selected by a user and non-selected pieces of placement and wiring graphic information not selected by the user, on said editor screen," as recited in claim 22. In Miura, rather, the user is not involved in

component placement or routing path determination, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 18. Claim 22 is thus submitted to be allowable as well, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 18. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 20 is earnestly solicited. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 23:

Claim 23 recites:

When one of said names of placement and wiring graphic information raised on said list is selected.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "when one of said names of placement and wiring graphic information raised on said list is selected," as recited in claim 23. In Miura, rather, the user is not involved in component placement or routing path determination, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 18. Claim 23 is thus submitted to be allowable as well, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 18. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 24:

Claim 24 recites:

Selecting placement and wiring graphic information for operation through a placement and wiring processing program.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "selecting placement and wiring graphic information for operation through a placement and wiring processing program," as recited in claim 24. In Miura, rather, the user is not involved in component placement or routing path determination, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 18. Claim 24 is thus submitted to be allowable as well, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 18. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 24 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 27:

Claim 27 recites:

When a portion of said area within said frame is enlarged and displayed on said editor screen, displaying a painted-out pattern inside said frame.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "when a portion of said area within said frame is enlarged and displayed on said editor screen, displaying a painted-out pattern inside said frame," as recited in claim 27. In Miura, rather, the user is not involved in component placement or routing path determination, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 18. Claim 27 is thus submitted to be allowable as well, for at least those reasons discussed above

with respect to the rejection of claim 27. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 27 is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 16 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,050,091 to Rubin (hereinafter "Rubin") in view of Miura. The rejection is traversed. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Claim 16 recites:

Redisplaying the placement and wiring graphic information associated to said designated modification information on said editor screen.

Rubin neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "redisplaying the placement and wiring graphic information associated to said designated modification information on said editor screen," as recited in claim 16. As Rubin, rather, describes in the Abstract:

Each component in the database is considered a node, and connections among components are considered as arcs. Changes are permitted only to nodes, and constraints are imposed only upon arcs. When components are changed, the effects of the changes are propagated to surrounding components by the arcs. In this manner the database manager insures that the circuit remains properly connected throughout the design process while allowing the propagation of changes up and down the hierarchy.

Since the database manager of Rubin insures that the circuit remains properly connected throughout the design process while allowing the propagation of changes up and down the hierarchy, Rubin has no need for, "redisplaying the placement and wiring graphic information associated to said designated modification information on said editor screen," as recited in claim 16.

Similarly, in Miura, the user is not involved in component placement or routing path determination, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 18. Miura consequently has no need for "redisplaying the placement and wiring graphic information associated to said designated modification information on said editor screen," as recited in claim 16, either. Thus, even if Rubin and Miura were combined as proposed in the final Office Action, the claimed invention would not result. Claim 16 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 28:

Claim 28 recites:

Redisplaying the placement and wiring graphic information associated with said designated modification information on said editor screen when said modification

information displayed on said window is designated.

Neither Rubin nor Miura teach, disclose, or suggest, "redisplaying the placement and wiring graphic information associated with said designated modification information on said editor screen when said modification information displayed on said window is designated," as recited in claim 28. Rubin has no need for "redisplaying the placement and wiring graphic information associated with said designated modification information on said editor screen when said modification information displayed on said window is designated," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 16.

Similarly, in Miura, the user is not involved in component placement or routing path determination, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 18. Miura consequently has no need for "redisplaying the placement and wiring graphic information associated with said designated modification information on said editor screen when said modification information displayed on said window is designated," as recited in claim 28, either. Thus, even if Rubin and Miura were combined as proposed in the final Office Action, the claimed invention would not result. Claim 28 is thus submitted to be allowable as well, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejections of claims 16 and 18. Claim 28 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 28 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 26:

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,247,455 to Yoshikawa (hereinafter "Yoshikawa"). The rejection is traversed. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Claim 26 recites:

Selecting a plurality of pieces of placement and wiring graphic information for operation through a placement and wiring processing program.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "selecting a plurality of pieces of placement and wiring graphic information for operation through a placement and wiring processing program," as recited in claim 26. In Miura, rather, the user is not involved in component placement or routing path determination, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 18.

Yoshikawa, for its part, is about "verifying wiring layouts including the steps of preparing a first reference value representing the minimum required distance between each combination of two arbitrary kinds of wiring elements," as described in the Abstract, and has no need for "selecting a plurality of pieces of placement and wiring graphic information for operation through a placement and wiring processing program," as recited in claim 26, either. Thus, even if Miura and Yoshikawa were combined as proposed in the final Office Action, the claimed invention

would not result. Claim 26 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 26 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 25:

Claims 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miura in view of PowerPoint® software program by Microsoft®. The rejection is traversed. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Claim 25 recites:

Selecting for display on an editor screen placement and wiring graphic information for operation through a placement and wiring processing program,.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "selecting for display on an editor screen placement and wiring graphic information for operation through a placement and wiring processing program," as recited in claim 25. In Miura, rather, the user is not involved in component placement or routing path determination, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 18. PowerPoint® does not either, and thus cannot make up for the deficiencies of Miura with respect to claim 25. Claim 25 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 25 is earnestly solicited.

New claim 29:

The fourth clause of claim 29 recites:

Specifying said placement and wiring graphic information associated with said relevant processing-related information on said editor screen when said user selects said designated processing-related information.

None of the cited references teach, disclose, or suggest, "specifying said placement and wiring graphic information associated with said relevant processing-related information on said editor screen when said user selects said designated processing-related information," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 18. Claim 29 is thus believed to be allowable as well, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 18.

Allowable Subject Matter:

The Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the allowance of claims 17, 19, and 21.

Conclusion:

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all of claims 16-29 are allowable over the cited references.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2/1/06

By:


Thomas E. McKiernan

Registration No. 37,889

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501